

## REMARKS

It is respectfully submitted that the office action is sufficiently non-informing that the Applicant is unable to formulate a complete reply. The office action, among other things, cites a reference not of record with respect to the rejection of claim 4 and simply groups the dependent claims together with respect to the rejections based on the reference to Jawahar. For example, in the paragraph before the rejection based on Jawahar on page 4, there is a reference with respect to claim 4 to a reference to England. But the application claim 4 was rejected based on a different reference. Nothing in Figure 5 of the cited reference to Galdes seems to have anything to do with the claimed invention. In fact, there is no mention of any webpage refresh in either cited reference to Galdes or Jawahar.

Therefore, at least the rejection of claim 4 seems to be untenable.


Likewise, there is no explanation of the bases for the rejection of claim 10 based on Galdes and a review of the reference seems to provide no basis for that rejection.

Similarly, with respect to Jawahar, all the dependent claims are simply grouped together and virtually the entire specification cited, despite the fact that it appears there is nothing of any pertinence in any of the material cited.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested and a new office action pointing out the basis for the rejection is requested to the extent these rejections would be maintained.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 25, 2007



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation